

Appm No. 10/760,184
Amdt. Dated September 26, 2006
Response to Office Action of July 25, 2006

4

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant thanks Examiner for the detailed Office Action dated July 25, 2006. In response to the issues raised, the Applicant offers the following submissions and amendments.

Amendments

Claim 8 has been amended to clarify that all printing fluid dispensers in the range engage the same complementary feature on the inkjet printer component. Positioning the dispenser outlet to correspond with the matching printer inlet ensures the correct fluid connection once the complementary feature is engaged. This minimizes the chance of any error when the user replenishes the ink cartridge.

Accordingly, the amendments do not add any new matter.

35 U.S.C. §102 - Claims 8, 2, 4 to 6

Claims 8, 2, 4 to 6 stand rejected for lack of novelty in light of US 6,213,597 to Lui.

As discussed above, amended claim 8 defines each dispenser in the range has an outlet positioned to form a fluid connection with the correct inlet on the inkjet printer to avoid any ink cross contamination. In contrast, the ink injection cylinders 13 of Lui, each engage the cartridge 11 at a different through hole 25. The through holes are at different positions on the cartridge 11 and so there is scope for the user to inadvertently inject the wrong color of ink into one of the storage compartments 20. There is no disclosure of a system that allows a range of dispensers can engage the inkjet printer at the same position while ensuring that the dispenser outlet connects with the correct inlet.

Accordingly, Lui fails to disclose all the elements of new claim 8, and therefore dependent claims 2, 4 or 6.

35 U.S.C. §103 - Claim 3

Claim 3 stands rejected as obvious in light of Lui in view of US 6,250,738 to Waller et al.

As discussed above, Lui fails to anticipate all the elements of new claim 8. Waller also fails to teach a range of printing fluid dispensers that have a locating feature to position each dispenser at a single location while preventing inadvertent cross contamination of printing fluid.

Accordingly, these references do not support a §103 rejection of claim 8. It follows that dependent claim 3 is likewise novel and inventive.

Appln No. 10/760,184
Amdt. Dated September 26, 2006
Response to Office Action of July 25, 2006

5

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejections have been successfully traversed and the application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,
Applicant:



KIA SILVERBROOK

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com
Telephone: +612 9818 6633
Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762